



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,757	02/14/2000	Keiichiro Hoashi	MM-20108	7122

2387 7590 03/11/2003

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.
20 NORTH WACKER DRIVE
36TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/503,757	HOASHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hai V. Nguyen	2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to the application filed on 14 February 2000.
2. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 14 February 2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

The Examiner only considers the abstracts in English in those patents or other documents.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Hughes** et al. (patent no. **US 6,065,055**).

6. As to claim 1, Hughes teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of automatic information filtering for identifying inappropriate information among various information provided through Internet and blocking presentation of identified inappropriate information, comprising the steps of:

entering an HTML (HyperText Markup Language) information provided through the Internet (Hughes, Abstract, col. 2, lines 30-51);

judging whether a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) of said HTML information entered from the Internet is a top page URL or not, the top page URL being a URL ending with a prescribed character string defined according to a URL hierarchical structure by which each URL is constructed (Hughes, Fig. 18, col. 2, line 30 – col.5, line 21; col. 8, lines 44-50);

extracting words appearing in information indicated by the top page URL and carrying out an automatic filtering to judge whether said information indicated by the top page URL is inappropriate or not according to the words extracted from said information indicated by the top page URL, when said URL of said HTML information is the top page URL (Hughes, Fig. 18; col. 4, lines 50-67);

registering an upper level URL derived from the top page URL into an inappropriate upper level URL list (filter list) and blocking presentation of said information indicated by the top page URL, when said information indicated by the top page URL is judged as inappropriate by the automatic filtering, the upper level URL being derived from the top page URL by keeping a character string constituting the top page URL only up to a rightmost slash (Hughes, Figs. 16-18; col. 8, lines 17-50);

Art Unit: 2142

comparing said URL of said HTML information with each URL registered in the inappropriate upper level URL list and judging whether there is any matching URL in the inappropriate upper level URL list when said URL of said HTML information is not the top page URL, and blocking presentation of information indicated by said URL of said HTML information when there is a matching URL in the inappropriate upper level URL list, the matching URL being one upper level URL whose character string is contained in said URL of said HTML information (col. 10, line 40 – col. 11, line 27);

extracting words appearing in said information indicated by said URL of said HTML information, and carrying out the automatic filtering to judge whether said information indicated by said URL of said HTML information is inappropriate or not according to the words extracted from said information indicated by said URL of said HTML information, when there is no matching URL in the inappropriate upper level URL list (Hughes, cols. 4-5; lines 50-21); and

blocking presentation of said information indicated by said URL of said HTML information when said information indicated by said URL of said HTML information is judged as inappropriate by the automatic filtering (Hughes, col. 8, line 8 – col. 9, line 34; col. 10, line 40 – col. 11, line 64).

7. As to claim 2, Hughes teaches, further comprising the steps of registering in advance URLs that provide inappropriate information in an inappropriate URL list (Hughes, Fig. 18); and

carrying out a third part rating based filtering for comparing said URL of said HTML information with each URL registered in the inappropriate URL list and judging

whether there is any matching URL in the inappropriate URL list, and blocking presentation of said information indicated by said URL of said HTML information when there is a matching URL in the inappropriate URL list (Hughes, Figs. 1-23; col. 8, line 8 –col. 9, line 34; col. 10, line 40 – col. 11, line 64).

8. Claim 3 recites an apparatus corresponding to the method of operations of claim 1. The apparatus claim is read in that it is simply follows the logical implementation of the method of operations indicated in the referenced claims to perform each of logical steps of controlling inappropriate material access in internet searching that results from the reference discussed above regarding the claim to the method of operations. Thus, the apparatus described in claim 3 would have been obvious in view of the elements provided in the reference, which correspond to the steps in the method of operations for the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 1.

9. Claim 4 is corresponding apparatus claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hughes** et al. patent no. **US 6,065,055** in view of well known features of using computer program product stored on a computer readable medium.

12. As to claim 5, Hughes discloses a computer program product stored on a computer readable medium tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a computer to perform the method steps of claim 1.

The Examiner takes **Official Notice** (see MPEP 2144.03) that it is well known in the networking art to utilize a computer readable medium for the storing and execution of the method and apparatus in order to perform the functional procedures for access controlling. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have included the use of a computer readable medium to store and execute the procedures of access controlling because use of storage medium for programs used in general purpose computer to execute special purpose functions was routine in the art (Hughes, cols. 6-14).

13. Claim 6 is corresponding apparatus claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

14. As to claim 7, Hughes teaches a method of automatic information filtering for identifying inappropriate information among various information provided through Internet and blocking presentation of identified inappropriate information, comprising the steps of:

obtaining word weights of words to be used in judging whether presentation of each information should be blocked or not according to words contained in each

Art Unit: 2142

information, by an automatic learning using learning data containing inappropriate information whose presentation should be blocked and appropriate information whose presentation should not be blocked (Hughes, the method and system explained in Figs. 1-23 operates in conjunction with a filter list. According to another embodiment, the present invention comprises a method and system of creating a filter list, col. 11, lines 20-64);

storing and managing the word weights in correspondence to respective words in a form of a weighted word list (filter list) (Hughes, Figs. 24-25; items 244, 254; col. 11, line 28 – col. 12, line 17);

extracting words contained in information entered from the Internet (Hughes, col. 4, lines 50-67); and

reading out the word weight for each word extracted from said information, from the weighted word list, calculating a total sum of the word weights of the words extracted from said information, and judging whether or not presentation of said information should be blocked or not according to the total sum (Hughes, Fig. 18; col. 10, line 40 – col. 11, line 27).

15. As to claim 8, Hughes teaches, wherein the automatic learning is based on a linear discrimination function that can discriminate the inappropriate information and the appropriate information on a vector space (Hughes, col. 4, line 50 – col. 5, line 21; col. 10, line 40 – col. 11, line 54).

16. Claim 9 is corresponding method claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2142

17. Claim 10 recites an apparatus corresponding to the method of operations of claim 7. The apparatus claim is obvious in that it simply follows the logical implementation of the method of operations indicated in the referenced claims to perform each of logical steps of controlling inappropriate material access in internet searching that results from the reference discussed above regarding the claim to the method of operations. Thus, the apparatus described in claim 10 would have been obvious in view of the elements provided in the reference, which correspond to the steps in the method of operations for the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 7.

18. Claims 11-12 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 8-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

19. Claims 13-15 are corresponding computer readable medium claims of claims 7-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2142

20. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-306-0276. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on 703-305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800/4700

KENNETH R. COULTER

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kenneth R. Coulter

Hai V. Nguyen
Art Unit 2142

hvn